



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

N✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,664	09/28/2001	Hideharu Osawa	Q65904	5123
7590	01/06/2005		EXAMINER	
Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037-3213			TON, ANABEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/937,664	OSAWA, HIDEHARU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anabel M Ton	2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 2-6 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (JP 07-281032) and in further view of Ohkawa (6,406,158).

3. Tanaka discloses the claimed invention except for the recitation of the light guide plate being formed with convexes and concaves having different densities or sizes depending upon the distance from the light source. Tanaka discloses a surface illuminant comprising a light source a light guide plate having opposed sides and being optically coupled to the light source for emitting light incident from the light source through one opposed side thereof and a reflection film which is disposed on the other opposed side of the light guide plate, wherein a wave length converting material is applied on the reflective film (fig A, 14, 15), the reflective film comprises a light storage material. Ohkawa discloses a light guide plate being formed with convexes and concaves having different densities or sizes depending upon the distance from the light source It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the light guide of Ohkawa in the device of Tanaka for the purpose of providing a light guide device with a desired diffusive surface to provide an evenly illuminated surface.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2-6 are allowed.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art cited of record does not teach the light guide plate of the instant invention in combination with the reflective film disposed on the other opposed side of the light guide plate wherein the light storage material is formed on the surface of the light guide plate or where the light guide plate is made of a transparent material in which light storage material is blended.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regards to the argument that Tanaka does not disclose a reflective film instead of a plate and that the purpose of the plate of Tanaka is different from that of the instant invention, it is duly noted the difference between a plate and film yet the plate of Tanaka is still serving the purpose of reflecting/reflection as is that of the film of the instant invention. Furthermore although it does not serve exactly the same reflecting function as that of the instant invention, this function is not recited in the claim thus cannot be considered. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Ohkawa's planar non-uniform plate is used to evenly diffuse the emitted light to produce an evenly distributed light emission. The device of Tanaka would be combinable since a replacement of light conducting plate 12 of Tanaka with the structurally non-uniform light diffusing plate of Ohkawa would produce an evenly distributed light emission surface in the device of Tanaka (evidence of a planar surface in contact with a bottom surface can be seen in figures 2 and 3 of Ohkawa, therefore applicant's assertion of loss of light due to interfacing problems is incorrect). With regards to applicant's arguments that the instant invention is a simpler structure since it has less members than that of the cited prior art in that the wavelength converting material is provided with the reflective film and comprises two members, it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anabel M Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2382. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anabel M Ton
Examiner
Art Unit 2875

AMT


Stephen Husar
Primary Examiner